



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—PROTESILAUDAMIA LAEVII.

Of the poem by Laevius on the story of Protesilaus and Laudamia nothing has come down to us but the title, composed of the wedded names of the man and the girl, and seven meager fragments. In calling attention to one of these fragments I have two objects in view: first, to point out its probable setting in the lost poem, and second, to indicate the possibility of combining it with another fragment not previously attributed to the Protesilaudamia.

The lines to which I have reference are preserved by Priscian, who says (II, p. 496 K): *pellicui quoque pro pellexi ueteres protulerunt*. Laevius in Laudamia:

aut
num quae piam alia te Ilias,
Asiatico ornata adfluens,
aut Sardiano ac Lydio
fulgens decore et gratia,
pellicuit?
"Or hath some other maid of Troy,
Rich in the gauds of Asia, bright
With Sardian, Lydian comeliness and charm,
Beguiled thee?"

As regards the text which I have printed, *num* is Müller's conjecture, accepted by Havet and de la Ville de Mirmont; the manuscripts of Priscian read *nunc*. With de Mirmont I accept Havet's *Ilias* for the *illo* (*illa*) of the manuscripts.¹

The words, of course, are Laudamia's; they voice a doubt of the fidelity of Protesilaus. On their setting the editors of Laevius have had little to say. Concerning themselves only with the question whether Laudamia is addressing her husband face to face or apostrophizing him in a soliloquy during his absence, they have entirely neglected a more vital matter, the motive for her reproach. Jealousy must have some cause, real or imaginary, and in the case of Laudamia the cause is anything but obvious. Protesilaus, torn from her arms on the eve of their marriage, is constrained to take part in the expedition to Troy. Though aware of the prophecy that the first man ashore will be the first

¹ *Te ilico* Osann; *de Ilio* Voss, Müller, Bährens.

to die, he leaps from the ship while the others are hanging back, and is killed by Hector soon afterward. As an amelioration of his hard lot, the gods of the nether world permit him to return to his bride for three hours. This brief space over, he goes back to the shades, whither she soon follows him by a self-inflicted death. Such, in its essentials, is the story of the pair as it was usually told in antiquity: it is singularly barren of grounds for jealousy. Laudamia could not in reason complain even of long-continued absence on the part of her lord, for the first courier from Troy would have brought her word of his fate; moreover, there is nothing to indicate that any great length of time elapsed between his departure and his return *via* Hades.¹ The position of Laudamia was quite different from that of a Clytemnestra or a Penelope.

For this reason Maximilian Mayer, the only person, I think, who has suggested a motive for Laudamia's reproachful words, advances the theory that Laevius departed from the usual version of the tale.² "Eine wirkliche Spur späterer Dichtung glaube ich dagegen bei zwei andern Römern zu finden; ich meine die eifersüchtigen Besorgnisse, denen die junge Gattin bei Laevius dem aus der Ferne Zurückkehrenden gegenüber Raum giebt, und auf die Properz Bezug nimmt (I, 19, 13):

illic (im Hades) formosae ueniant chorus heroinae,
 quas dedit Argiuis Dardana praeda uiris;
 quarum nulla tua fuerit mihi, Cynthia, forma
 gratior.

Dieser bei dem vorzeitigen Tode des Helden nicht allzu nahe liegende Gedanke hat, wie ich vermuthe, seinen Anlass in einer Ortssage, welche thatsächlich den Protesilaos mit kriegsgefangenen Frauen zurückkehren liess. Diese vom Epos unabhängige Ueberlieferung, welche den frühen Tod des Helden nicht kennt, die Gründungssage von Skione, findet sich bei Konon 13. Danach soll Protesilaos mit der kriegsgefangenen Aithilla, einer Tochter Laomedons und Schwester des Priamos, auf der Heimfahrt in jener Gegend gelandet sein: während aber er und seine Genossen landeinwärts gingen, um Wasservorrath zu holen, hätte jene im Verein mit den übrigen gefangenen

¹ Cf. Catull. 68, 85 quod scibant Parcae non longo tempore abisse si miles muros isset ad Iliacos.

² Der Protesilaos des Euripides, Hermes, 20 (1885), p. 132.

Troerinnen die Schiffe angezündet und so die Griechen zum Dortbleiben genöthigt".

In Mayer's opinion, then, there was a version of the story according to which Protesilaus came back to Laudamia in the flesh, accompanied by captive women from Troy. Hence the jealousy of Laudamia in Laevius; hence the mention of the *heroinae* in Propertius. But this appears to me, *εἰ μὴ ἀγροικότερον ἢν εἰπεῖν*, flatly impossible. The version which he postulates is a fusion of the ordinary story with the entirely distinct myth of the *κρίσις* of Scione.¹ The story of the foundation of Scione is told only by Conon; the contaminated version is purely hypothetical. It lacks even the support of the passages which it was invented to explain. In the case of Propertius we need but look at Mayer's quotation in its proper context:

illic Phylacides iocundae coniugis heros
 non potuit caecis inmemor esse locis,
 sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis
 10 Thessalis antiquam uenerat umbra domum.
 illic quicquid ero, semper tua dicar imago:
 traicit et fati littora magnus amor.
 illic formosae ueniant chorus heroinae,
 quas dedit Argiuis Dardana praeda uiris;
 quarum nulla tua fuerit mihi, Cynthia, forma
 gratior.

It is at once clear that in lines 7-10, where Protesilaus is referred to, there is no hint of anything but the usual story of his dying and coming to life again; and that in lines 13-14, where the *heroinae* are introduced, there is no shadow of a reference to Protesilaus. Propertius has dropped the Protesilaus story, and is simply thinking in a general way of the fair Trojans whom he is likely to see in the lower world and who will not be able to alter his allegiance to Cynthia, thinking of Andromache and Cassandra rather than of Aethilla, sister-in-law of Hecuba (save the mark!), whom there is no reason to believe he ever heard of.²

The Laevius passage, then, is the only one in which jealousy on the part of Laudamia is intimated. At first glance Mayer's

¹ On this story see Türk, Protesilaos, Roscher, p. 3162.

² Cf. Rothstein, on l. 13: Die Heroinnen der Unterwelt kommen, um den neuen Ankömmling zu sehen. . . . Zu der Vorstellung eines feierlichen Empfanges ist diese Anschauung ausgebildet bei Stat. Silv. V. 1. 253 (vgl. Culex 261). . . . Gerade die Heroinnen nennt in demselben Zusammenhang Herodes Atticus in der Grabinschrift auf seine Gattin (Kaibel, Ep. Graec. 1046, 57) *ἐς χάρον ἐρχομένην προτεράων ἡμιθεῶν*". See also his note on l. 14.

assumption that Protesilaus is accompanied by captive women from Troy would appear to explain this passage, but in reality it lacks much of so doing. Under such circumstances she would have been jealous, to be sure, but she would not have expressed her jealousy in the terms in which Laevius makes her express it.

aut
num quaepiam alia te Ilias,
Asiatico ornatu adfluens,
aut Sardonio ac Lydio
fulgens decore et gratia,
pellicuit?

Her language is general, not specific,—*quaepiam alia*, not *istaec quidem altera*. The rival whom she fears is to her only in posse, not in esse.

It is quite unnecessary to create a hypothetical version of the story, for the usual version affords us a motive entirely adequate to explain the jealousy of Laudamia. It lies in the fact that Protesilaus had to leave her so soon after coming back to her. From this standpoint I should reconstruct the setting of the fragment in the following way. When he appears, she thinks him to have come from Troy; the first intimation that he must return to the place from whence he came fills her with amazement, for she naturally supposes that he means to go back to Troy. Under this delusion she plies him with indignant, suspicious questions: "Have you not done enough for Menelaus? Have I, your bride, no claims? Have you ceased to love me? Have I done anything to estrange you, or are your affections engaged over there?" Little by little she extorts from the reluctant lips of Protesilaus an explanation which transforms her incipient anger into black despair.

Here we have, it seems to me, a good and sufficient motive and a poetical setting. But is there any warrant for the assumption on which its validity depends, that Laudamia thinks her husband come from Troy? Not in the account of Hyginus (103): quod uxor Laodamia Acasti filia cum audisset eum perisse flens petit a diis ut sibi cum eo tres horas colloqui liceret. quo impetrato a Mercurio reductus . . . est. According to Hyginus, then, Laudamia not only had heard of her husband's death, but herself brought about his return from the lower world; consequently she could not but realize that he came thence and must return thither.

At the time when Mayer wrote, this would have constituted a weighty objection to the interpretation which I offer. But in 1891 Richard Wagner published an extensive fragment of an epitome of Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* which he had discovered a few years previously in the Vatican Library, and which contains the following reference to the story of Laudamia:¹ *τούτου γυνή Λαοδάμεια καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἦρα καὶ ποιήσασα εἰδωλον Πρωτεσίλαφ παραπλήσιον, τούτῳ προσωμίλει. Ἑρμῆς δὲ ἐλεησάντων θεῶν ἀνήγαγε Πρωτεσίλαον ἐξ Ἰδίου Λαοδάμεια δὲ ἰδοῦσα καὶ νομίσασα αὐτὸν ἐκ Τροίας παρῆναι, τότε μὲν ἐχάρη, πάλιν δὲ ἐπαναχθέντος εἰς Ἰδίου αὐτὴν ἐφόνευσεν.* Here we have exactly what we want,—a direct statement to the effect that Laudamia thinks her husband has come back from Troy. Moreover, the statement is derived from the one source which Laevius is most likely to have drawn upon, the Protesilaus of Euripides.² There is nothing, therefore, in the way of our supposition that Laudamia is under this delusion in Laevius.

The question now arises whether Laevius derived the jealousy *motif* from Euripides along with the situation. Unfortunately the *Epitoma Vaticana* does not tell us how the disillusionment of Laudamia was effected in the Protesilaus. Disillusionment, however, there certainly was; and we may be sure that it was brought about in a striking manner. This follows not only from the fact that her cruel error and her causeless joy are thought worthy of record in the epitome of an epitome, but from the consideration that Euripides, *τραγικώτατος τῶν ποιητῶν*, is not in the least likely to have overlooked the possibilities of the highly dramatic situation which he had created. Let us consider this point a moment. If Laudamia were human (and what else could she be in Euripides?) she must have said at once: "But we heard that you were dead!" How did Protesilaus answer? Did he shatter her delusion immediately, and so submit her to a horrid shock, and himself and the audience to three hours (or the stage equivalent thereto) of *alaï alaï* and *φεῦ φεῦ*? Or did he humor a natural

¹ R. Wagner, *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca*, etc., Leipzig, 1891, 17, 16 (p. 65); cf. p. 199.

² Wagner, l. c.: Höfer, *Laudamia*, Roscher, p. 1827. As she has had tidings of his death, we must suppose either that she does not believe them true (Wagner), or that she does credit them till the sudden appearance of Protesilaus overthrows her belief (Höfer). I favor the latter view: her previous acceptance of the report would count for little in the face of the evidence of her senses. It should be borne in mind that Protesilaus is not a specter; he actually comes to life.

inclination to spare himself and her, and leave her a while in her error? In my opinion he took the latter course, and I think we have his equivocal answer in the much-discussed fragment of the Protesilaus πολλ' ἐλπίδες ψεύδουσι καὶ λόγοι βροτοῖς. Sooner or later, however, he had to tell her the truth, and almost inevitably the attempt to break it to her gently would give rise to a misunderstanding. It seems to me, therefore, that the situation in Euripides cries out for just such a treatment as we have ascribed to it in Laevius. For this reason, and also because the idea is quite good enough for Euripides and rather too good for Laevius, I believe that it originated with the tragedian.

We come now to our second theme. The interrogations of a jealous woman do not come singly, and Laudamia was no exception to the rule. Since the citation of Priscian begins with *aut*, it is clear that this question was originally preceded by another like it in form and content. Just such a complement is ready to hand. Under the lemma *hostire, offendere, laedere* we find in Nonius (p. 121 M) the following quotation: Laevius Erotopaegnia lib. II :

hunc quod meum admissum nocens
hostit uoluntatem tuam.

Instead of Laevius the manuscripts read Pacuvius, but we know that Laevius was the author of a work called Erotopaegnia, that his name is almost always maltreated by copyists and that Pacuvius is not likely to have written anything of the sort. Consequently by common consent the name of Laevius has been placed in the text of Nonius since the time of Mercer, and the quotation has been included among the scanty remnants of the writings of Laevius.

Although *hunc* is clearly corrupt, the general sense of the passage is plain enough. Editors agree that the words are those of an injured girl to her lover. "Have I done anything to offend you?" It is a stock reproach, of which there are plenty of examples: a few from the Heroides will serve our turn.

Oenone (V, 6): ne tua permaneam, quod mihi crimen obest?
Phyllis (II, 27): dic mihi, quid feci nisi non sapienter amaui?
Dido (VII, 164): quod crimen dicis praeter amasse meum?
Briseis (III, 41): qua merui culpa fieri tibi uilis, Achille?
quo leuis a nobis tam cito fugit amor?

Not only are some such words as these apposite to our context, but they are almost necessary to it. Either this thought or its positive counterpart, the *exprobratio immemoris beneficii*, "Have

I not done this and that to please you?" is put in the mouth of every wronged maiden in poetry; and as Laudamia had done nothing special to insure her husband's loyalty, it is ten to one that she brought out the fact that at least she had done nothing to forfeit it.

Both fragments are naturally in the same meter, the iambic dimeter: a far more significant fact, however, is that the last word of the Nonius quotation, *tuam*, terminates in a syllable capable of elision, so that *aut*, the first word of the other quotation, can be taken on at the end of the line. Note what Havet, speaking of the Priscian fragment, has to say on this score:¹ "Le premier dimètre est trop long: *aut* est à rejeter sur le membre précédent (*qui devait se terminer par une syllabe élidée*) comme *et* dans les saphiques d'Horace".

The formal parallelism of the two fragments is striking. Observe *hostit* and *pellicuit*, each beginning its line; the pronouns *quod* and *quaepiam* and their position, and the correspondence of subject and object in both clauses. To complete the parallelism and make the fragments fit together perfectly is a simple matter. The manuscript reading *hunc* is a manifest corruption of *nunc*; we need only assume, as Bährens and Müller have already assumed,² that *nunc* is a misreading of *num*, just as in the Priscian fragment. The result speaks for itself:

num quod meum admissum nocens
 hostit uoluntatem tuam? aut
 num quaepiam alia te Ilias,
 Asiatico ornatu adfluens,
 aut Sardiano ac Lydio
 fulgens decore et gratia,
 pellicuit?³
 Hath any hurtful deed of mine
 Run counter to thy heart's desire?
 Or hath some other maid of Troy,
 Rich in the gauds of Asia, bright
 With Sardinian, Lydian comeliness and charm,
 Beguiled thee?

To me, at least, this combination carries conviction. I have no doubt, however, that some will be inclined to stick at the

¹ Rev. de Phil. 15 (1891), p. 7. The italics are mine.

² Both claim the emendation: in Poet. Lat. Fragm. (1879) Bährens says *scripsi*, and in Müller's Nonius we find *numquod* (*fuit nunquod*) *M.*

³ For *num* . . . *aut num* see Plaut. Pseud. 219; Cic. Phil. 2, 92; Top. 45; De Div. 1, 24; 2, 9.

point that *num* in each case is conjectural. In reply to this objection I would say in the first place that we are not dealing with ad hoc conjectures. In each case *num* has been already suggested, for the reason that the editors want a question, the form in which such reproaches are usually cast, and do not want *nunc*, which they find it hard to account for. The readiest way to get the question and eliminate *nunc* is to change *nunc* to *num*. In the second place the correction is an extremely easy one. The words *num* and *nunc* are constantly confused in the manuscripts (Plautus, for example, is full of instances),¹ owing to the fact that in the Rustic Capital script a carelessly drawn M is very difficult to distinguish from NC. That the mistake should be repeated is not at all surprising, for the corruption of *num* to *nunc* in one instance would almost inevitably have induced a similar corruption in the other. Naturally it is to be assumed that the transmission of the text of Laevius is responsible for the double corruption, and not the independent traditions of Nonius and Priscian.

The fact that the fragment quoted by Nonius is ascribed by him to the Erotopaegnia does not stand in the way of its assignment to the Protesilaudamia, for it is generally agreed that this poem and many others similarly cited by name were included in the collection entitled Erotopaegnia.² This opinion is based chiefly on Charisius (I, 288 K), who speaks of "the Phoenix of Laevius, the last ode in the Erotopaegnia", thus making it clear that separate poems in this work in some cases bore separate titles.

An issue is raised by the fact that Nonius refers the citation to the second book of the Erotopaegnia, since Havet has already assigned the Laudamia³ to the sixth book. This he does by capping a fragment from Nonius (209 M):

in eum inruunt, cachinnos,
ioca, dicta fusitantes

with one from Charisius (I, 204 K); Laevius Erotopaegnon VI:
lasciuiturque ludunt.

¹ E. g., Poen. 1258; Rud. 328; 611; 636; 962; 1288; Truc. 641; Mil. 1019.

² Bährens, *Fragm. Poet. Rom.*, p. 287: "fragmenta duplici modo a grammaticis adferuntur, partim secundum libros, partim secundum singula carmina, quorum compluria sine dubio unusquisque continuit liber". Cf. Schanz in *Iw. Müller*, VIII, 1, p. 34, p. 36.

³ *Rev. de Phil.* 15 (1891), p. 12.

In such a case we can only weigh the two combinations against one another and determine which is the more probable, since absolute proof or disproof of either is in the nature of things impossible. My own feeling is that Havet's combination has distinctly less in favor of it and more against it than mine. In the first place, it is doubtful whether his two fragments are in the same meter. The words *lasciuiterque ludunt* are not necessarily an Anacreontic: they can just as well be a catalectic dimeter, used either by itself as a clausula or with others in a system.¹ In the second place, the phrase is susceptible of more than one interpretation. It is of course applicable to the *Fescennina iocatio*, but it is equally applicable to the wanton play of kids in pasture or the dalliance of lovers. In the words *mea Vatiēna, amabo*—"Sweet Vatiēna, prithee!"—we have another Anacreontic from the pen of Laevius. The atmosphere of *basiationes* into which it introduces us would form just as appropriate a setting for *lasciuiterque ludunt* as the *Fescennina iocatio* of the Protesilaudamia.

To be sure, all this does not prove that Havet is wrong and that I am right. It merely shows how much less plausible his suggestion is than one which combines two fragments unquestionably kindred in sense, parallel in form, and not only identical in meter but so constituted that a superfluous word in one finds a place in the other.

To sum up in a word, it seems to me altogether probable that the fragments in question belong together, that the Protesilaudamia stood in the second book of the Erotopaegnia, and that Laevius, following Euripides, based Laudamia's jealousy on the fact that Protesilaus had to leave her so soon after his return.

A. M. HARMON.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

¹ Cf. Marius Victorinus (VI, 138 K): "huius tenoris ac formae quosdam uersus poetas lyricos carminibus suis indidisse cognouimus, ut apud Arbitrium inuenimus, cuius exemplum

Memphitides puellae
sacris deum paratae.

item

tinctus colore noctis
Aegyptias choreas.

Cf. also Terent. Maur. 2486; Diom. I, 518 K.